IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.3686 OF 2006.

Rahul S. Randive & others ..Applicants.
V/s
State of Maharashtra .. Respondents.

Mr. S. A. Rajeshirke h/for Mr. S.S. Salunkhe for the applicants.

Smt. M.M. Deshmukh,APP for the State.

CORAM : S.C. DHARMADHIKARI, J.

DATE : 17TH OCTOBER, 2006.

P.C.

. The applicants apprehend arrest in connection with C.R.No.181 of 2006, registered at Pandharpur Taluka Police Station alleging offence punishable under Sections 143, 148,149,341, 323, 363,365,395,506 of Indian Penal Code.

2. The applicants had applied for bail but the learned Additional Sessions Judge has rejected the application of the present applicants.

3. The submission of the learned Counsel for the applicants before me is that the complaint against the applicants is out of political vendetta and rivlary. It

is inconceivable that the complainant Sarpanch would not be allowed to go and reach the venue of the meeting, when the applicants belong to a group which is in clear majority. The father of the complainant has lodged this FIR.

4. On the last occasion a copy of the statement of Sandeep Ghadge was not produced and that is why the matter was adjourned. Today that statement is produced for my perusal. The said statement specifically names the applicants as being those who got down from Tata Indica vehicle in the middle of the road and thereafter kidnapped Santosh. From perusal of the statement and the order of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, in my view, merely because the application of other accused is granted, does not mean that the applicants before me deserve to be granted pre-arrest bail. There are specific allegations and custodial interrogation would therefore, be necessary.

3. In such circumstances, there is no merit in the contentions of the applicants that they deserve pre-arrest bail. Application is dismissed.

(S.C. DHARMADHIKARI, J.)